

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 8-18 remain pending in the present application. Claim 3 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 4, 6, 8 and 15 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 9, 14, 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Prete, III in view of Farrington, et al. Claim 3 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 3 depended from Claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 3 and Claim 3 has been cancelled. Thus, Applicants believe Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 2, 9, 14 and 18, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Claim 15 has been amended to dependent form to depend from Claim 1. Thus, Applicants believe Claim 15 also patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner indicated that Claims 3-8, 10-13, 16 and 17 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening

claims on page 3 of the Office Action. On the Office Action Summary, the Examiner indicated that Claims 3, 7, 8, 16 and 17 were objected to. Because only Claims 1-4, 6 and 8-18 were pending and only Claims 1, 2, 9, 14, 15 and 18 were rejected, Applicants believe the Examiner meant to list Claims 3, 4, 6, 8, 10-13, 16 and 17 are objected to.

As indicated above, the limitations of Claim 3 have been added to Claim 1 and Claim 3 has been cancelled. Claim 4 has been amended to depend from Claim 1.

Claims 6 and 8 each depended from Claim 1, Claims 6 and 8 have been amended to independent form to include the limitations of pre-amended Claim 1.

Claims 10-13 are dependent claims which have not been amended.

Claim 16, which was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected claim, is believed to be allowable without amendment since it is an independent claim. Claim 17 depends from Claim 16.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

Dated: January 6, 2006

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg